Human Events *A Weekly Analysis for the American Citizen*
Editorial Office 1710 Rhode Island Ave., N. W., WASHINGTON 6, D. C. *Telephone* NATIONAL 2066
VOL. VII, No. 19, *Issue Number* 328, MAY 10, 1950 *Editor:* FRANK C. HANIGHEN

THE LOST PEACE: AN AUTOPSY

by William Henry Chamberlin

Back of the wave of popular emotion aroused by Senator McCarthy's charges lies more than a suspicion that some "poor security risks" have infiltrated the State Department and unduly influenced its policies. There is the deeper feeling of frustration, still somewhat unconscious and inarticulate, because, five years after the end of a victorious war, the peace has so obviously been lost.

It is one of the monumental ironies of history that America's participation in the late war has led to precisely the situation which it was designed to avert. How often the evangelists of the "Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies", "Fight for Freedom" and similar organizations insisted that "we could not live in a totalitarian world", that, even if Hitler could not directly invade America it would be intolerable to endure the political, economic and moral consequences of an Axis victory!

Well, the Roosevelt Adminstration shaped its course according to this advice and steered an ever plainer course in 1940 and 1941 toward involvement in global conflict. We got into the war and won the war -- and where are we now?

Stalin's totalitarian empire controls far more territory and natural wealth, considerably more manpower and has a far more persuasive propaganda approach than Hitler's could have claimed at the high tide of Nazi military success. It may reasonably be argued that we are more vulnerable to attack in 1950 than we were in 1940, simply because of the immense increase in the range of aircraft and the multiplication of destructive weapons.

We are spending on armaments and on subsidies to prospective allies sums that would have seemed fantastic by pre-war standards. But we have little reason to feel secure.

The names that were once clarion calls to a second crusade -- China, Czechoslovakia, Poland -- carry a sound of hollow mockery today. For all these lands, which we were supposed, as a moral and holy duty, to rescue from the grasp of oppression, have fallen under Communist regimes which lose no opportunity to blackguard the United States.

Disillusionment with the results of our First Crusade built up steadily during the Twenties and Thirties. Years after Armistice Day,

Copyright 1950 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1918, William Allen White, a good barometer of American public opinion, could write:

"Fifteen years ago came the Armistice and we all thought it was to be a new world. It is! But a lot worse than it was before.

"Ten million men were killed and many more maimed, fifty billion dollars worth of property destroyed, the world saddled with debts.

"And for what? Would it have been any worse if Germany had won? Ask yourself honestly. No one knows.

"Is this old world as safe for democracy as it was before all those lives were lost?"

Seventy-one per cent of the people who replied to a public opinon poll in 1937 expressed the belief that American participation in the First World War was a mistake.

II

The causes of disillusionment after America's Second Crusade are even stronger than the reasons which led to this mood in the Twenties and the Thirties. Wilson's Fourteen Points might be considered a brilliant success if one considers the abyss which yawns between the principles of the Atlantic Charter and the Four Freedoms, America's professed war aims, and the realities of the post-war world.

No war has left such a legacy of miserable, uprooted human beings and unjust frontiers. Some 14 million German nationals and ethnic Germans were driven from eastern Germany and other regions in eastern and Central Europe. Several millions of Poles were expelled from East Poland, some of whom were resettled in provinces stolen from Germany. Mass deportations have ravaged the Baltic States. A million or more displaced persons fled from Soviet land grabs and Soviet tyranny.

Not one of the drastic surgical operations on Europe's boundaries was carried out by the will of the people affected. What a mockery of the first three clauses of the Atlantic Charter: "no territorial aggrandizement"; "no territorial changes that do not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the peoples concerned"; "the right of all peoples to choose the form of government under which they will live".

The other clauses have also been ignored. The restrictions imposed on German and Japanese industry, trade and shipping cannot be reconciled with the promise "to further the enjoyment by all States, great and small, victor or vanquished, of access, on equal terms, to the trade and to the raw materials of the world".

Terrific war destruction, largely caused by "obliteration bombing", and the vindictive peace have not helped to "secure for all improved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

labor standards, economic advancement and social security". Five years after the end of America's Second Crusade "men in all the lands" are not "living out their lives in freedom from fear and want". Nor are "all men traversing the high seas and oceans without hindrance".

The last clause of the Atlantic Charter holds out the prospect of "lightening for peace-loving peoples the burden of armaments". But this burden has become more crushing than it was before the crusade took place. All in all, the promises of the Charter seem to have evaporated in a wraith of Atlantic mist. The Four Freedoms have fared no better.

These were, it may be recalled, freedom of speech and expression, and of religion, and freedom from fear, and want. News from the greatly increased number of Iron Curtain capitals does not suggest that these freedoms have become the rule in the post-war world.

III

Nor can the late war be convincingly justified as an unavoidable exercise in national defense. What Harry Elmer Barnes has called the historical blackout cannot obscure permanently the significance of such moves as the destroyer deal, the lend-lease act, the inauguration of an undeclared Naval war in the Atlantic, the commercial blockade of Japan, the cold-shouldering of Konoye's overtures, the Hull note of November 26, which the Army Joint Board characterized as "the document that touched the button that started the war".

The conflict in which America became involved in December, 1941, was not a war of elementary self-defense but a crusade. And it was waged not as a cool-headed attempt to create a more favorable balance of power in Europe and Asia, but as a war of extermination against SIN, which was supposedly the exclusive property of Germany and Japan.

Some of Roosevelt's apologists maintain that, if he deceived the American people (as he certainly did), it was for their own good. But this argument that the end justifies the means at least assumes that the end has been achieved. Not a single positive objective of the Atlantic Charter or the Four Freedoms has been accomplished. Nor has American national security been visibly enhanced when American diplomats in China are subjected to insults unknown since the Boxer Uprising and an unarmed American airplane is shot down with impunity over the Baltic and every little Iron Curtain country vies with its neighbor in kicking around American official representatives.

IV

America's Second Crusade was a product of illusions which are already bankrupt. It is in these illusions, for which President Roosevelt and his most trusted advisers must take full responsibility, not

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the melodramatic achievements of "master spies", that a historical autopsy will find the main causes of the lost peace.

It was an illusion that the United States was at any time in danger of invasion from Nazi Germany. It was an illusion that Hitler was bent on the destruction of the British Empire. It was an illusion that China was capable of becoming a strong and friendly Power in the Far East. It was an illusion that a powerful Soviet Union, in a weakened, impoverished Eurasia, would be a force for peace, conciliation, stability and international co-operation.

It was an illusion that the dangers of totalitarian power could be banished by giving unconditional support to one form of totalitarianism against another. It was an illusion that a combination of personal charm and appeasement could melt away designs of conquest and domination which have deep roots in Russian history and Communist philosophy. It was an illusion that it is all one world.

As Herbert Hoover dryly remarked recently: "The one world idea seems to be lost in the secret files."

Fruit harvested from seeds of illusion is always bitter.

Unfortunately the outliving of America's wartime illusions has been an uneven process. Only a small hard core of Communists and extreme fellow travellers now upholds the proposition that Stalin's dictatorship is a "peace-loving democracy". But hatred and suspicion of Germany are kept alive by certain vocal and well organized groups; and this is true to a lesser degree as regards Japan.

It is high time not only to recognize frankly the appalling illusions which cost us so dear in the Second World War, but also to scrap decisively the policies which grew out of these illusions. There is, after all, only one way to "get along" with a vast totalitarian empire like the Soviet Union. This is to remain stronger, militarily, economically, politically, morally.

But we cannot count on superior strength so long as we pursue policies which paralyze the potentialities of Germany and Japan as bastions against Soviet imperialist Communism. The surest way to win the cold war is to substitute for the obsolete state of war with Germany and Japan a peace based on equality and cemented by common interest.

Quotation up to a paragraph is permitted with credit to HUMAN EVENTS. For reproduction or more extensive quotation address requests to HUMAN EVENTS, 1710 Rhode Island Avenue, N. W., Washington 6, D. C. Trial subscription, three months for $3. Six months, $5.50. One year, $10. Two years, $18. Domestic airmail (including APO and FPO) one year, $12.00; foreign (regular mail) one year, $11. Foreign airmail rates on request. Please remit in U.S.A. DOLLARS. Allow two weeks for new subscriptions or change of address to become effective.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Not Merely Gossip *A Supplement to* Human Events Vol. VII, No. 19

UNIVERSITY OF OREGON RECEIVED MAY 17 1950

By Frank C. Hanighen May 10, 1950

THE PRESIDENT AND POLITICS: "The President's a rotten poker player. He always stays in the pot, no matter what he holds", one of his boon companions reportedly remarked to friends the other day. The latter was referring, not to politics, but to the relaxing games in which Mr. Truman is known to participate with certain cronies from time to time. Well, H. T. "stayed in the pot" in 1948 and won. But old experts on poker and politics agree that this policy can't always succeed. Therefore, observers believe the President's well-known stubbornness will seriously hurt him in the present political situation, unless unexpected caution prompts him, on the present speaking tour, to modify his attitude on the subversive situation.

A brief trip to Texas and the Midwest last week gave us some impressions of public sentiment and interest. Texas is so busy growing and making money that one would suppose politics and subversives would not interest its inhabitants. In Houston, we found one sheet running Seeds of Treason, serially, starting on the front page; and its competitor had Fred Woltman's syndicated exposure of the Amerasia case in the same news spot. Texans with whom we conversed were praising the Wisconsin Senator and lewdly cursing the State Department. Then came news that voters had elected the first GOP Congressman in Texas in a quarter of a century. Yes, Mr. Truman has work to do on his tour.

Yet all visitors reported him confident as he set forth, and it may be remarked that those around him do little to discourage this mood. One of the interesting phenomena which future historians will study will be the influence of friends on Mr. Truman. And one aspect that should interest scholars will be how old faces remain among the Presidential entourage, but in progressively different guises. Judge Samuel Rosenman and Mr. Clark Clifford used to serve officially as close advisers and literary assistants in the White House. Now they are no longer officials and they appear as old friends -- or should one say, "courtiers"? -- in the Executive offices, or on social occasions on the Presidential yacht. Mr. Clifford is retained by Radio Corporation of America, and Mr. Rosenman by RCA's competitor, Columbia Broadcasting Company. Indeed, a disarming tableau!

Whatever the sanguine talk in the presence of the President, there are no signs that the barometer is ascending. After all, why should the McCarthy affair die down soon? We hear persistent rumors, from various quarters, that a prominent former Administration figure, involved in serious trouble because of the subversive situation, has received (not, of course, from friends of the Administration) a remunerative proposition to "tell all". Also we may report, on good authority, that a certain Left Wing CIO leader is seriously considering whether or not to emulate Mr. Whittaker Chambers in the latter's final confessional role. It is -- or should be -- a commonplace that in public "scandals", such matters have a way of growing, with many unexpected volunteer helpers.

* * * * *

SENATOR WAYNE MORSE: One political contest about which Republicans are having uneasy thoughts these days is the Senate race in Oregon where Wayne Morse must stand for re-election. There's a reason: The conviction has never died out that Arthur Vandenberg's triumphant re-election in 1946 (100 per cent plurality) was partly due to a strong, silent Democratic assist in the shape of a nonentity as a Democratic opponent and a tepid campaign for the nonentity. Is something like this going to happen in Oregon? It is not forgotten that Vandenberg in '46 announced at once

Copyright 1950 by Human Events, Inc.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the sweeping Republican victory that fall was a nation-wide endorsement of the bipartisan foreign policy; nor that Senator Fulbright of Arkansas, on the same day, urged that President Truman appoint Vandenberg Secretary of State. The Democratic technique in wheedling, seduction or purchase of Republicans has grown surer with the years. (Not the least effective part of the technique are the clamorous out-cries about Republicans being in league with reactionary Southerners in Congress, a dark camarilla designed to frustrate the hopes and yearnings of "the people".) A few more rounds of success in this kind of political racket and the Republican delegation in Congress will be reduced to a collection of Fair Deal stooges.

* * * * *

COLUMNISTS AND THE GOP: Senator Taft occasionally complains that the Fair Dealers have succeeded in capturing many of the more adroit columnists and feature writers and that the day-in-day-out hammering of these people has powerfully influenced Congress and public opinion generally. This is true and it has long puzzled us why the Republicans didn't get hold of some articulate intellectuals of their own. Anyhow . . . it is worthwhile observing some of the more recent performances of one of the most skillful of the Fair Deal troupe -- Doris Fleeson.

Miss Fleeson is noted for her "clean copy"; her column is never sloppy either in the writing or in the way she plants her ideas. Sometimes Truman wounds her, but her heart belongs to Daddy and nobody can rationalize out loud for the Administration better than Doris. There she was on April 24, whitewashing Acheson and giving McCarthy the business: "Conversations within the State Department support the Secretary's statement that morale there is excellent. . . . There has never been a time when fewer top jobs were held by the fat cats of politics, the heavy campaign contributors. The truth is that the State Department's work is now so difficult and time consuming, only people who will work hard care to be there." Miss Fleeson knows perfectly well that nobody's worried right now about fat cats in the State Department. What gives the good citizen the jitters is the thought of fellow travellers who "will work hard" and who "care to be there".

Another phase of Miss Fleeson in action concerns her intermittent flower pelting at Margaret Chase Smith, the Republican Senator from Maine. Mrs. Smith is a member of the group of so-called New England "progressives" (Lodge, Aiken, Flanders, et al.) that the Americans for Democratic Action have been wooing so vigorously. The lady followed in the wake of Vandenberg on foreign policy; almost any kind of oleaginous social security legislation suits her fine. Obviously Mrs. Smith is a prospect for seduction, by the Adminstration if not the ADA.

Miss Fleeson frequently broods on Mrs. Smith and does her best to provoke Republican discord by saying what an ideal candidate for Vice President Mrs. Smith would be -- on the GOP '52 ticket. Would it not symbolize the increasing influence of women in politics, etc. etc. etc? Dressing up Mrs. Smith's ambitions in feminist garb is a smart one. It isn't Mrs. Smith's sex that makes Republicans nervous about her; it's her ideas. With very little effort the lady Senator could qualify as a 100 per cent Fair Dealer. That Miss Fleeson can use this fact in a subtle playing of both sides of the street for Truman's advantage may be clearly seen in the Fleeson column for May 1. After stating that Truman was going to appoint Mrs. Smith to the United States delegation to UNESCO, Doris went on: "The appointment represents another gesture in the direction of a bipartisan foreign policy. In making it, the State Department and the President have overruled the politicians who said the Administration should not participate in the build-up of the woman Senator now being mentioned for the 1952 Republican slate."

* * * * *

SENATORIAL COURTESY: The Senate has certainly been in the spotlight in the past few weeks, reports Edna Lonigan from Capitol Hill. The press devoted much attention to the attack which Administration followers made on Senator McCarthy. This assault on

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Wisconsin Senator was remarkable for two reasons not sufficiently emphasized. It is a fixed rule of the Senate that no Senator may make any statement that impugns the motives of another Senator; and this is one of the essential traditions of representative government. Nevertheless Senator Lucas rose on May 3, and read a statement from an employee of the Executive arm, addressed to the press, saying there was "no shred of truth" in McCarthy's statement. Senator Wherry, Minority Leader, rose instantly and demanded that Lucas be deprived of the floor. Wherry's request and Vice President Barkley's ruling in his favor were noted in the press.

What was not noted was the finesse with which the Adminstration group maneuvered after Barkley's ruling so that their charges were repeated and amplified. Senator Myers recaptured the floor for Lucas, who then read his charge again. He followed it with a noble statement about how many decent and honorable men there are working in the State Department (which carried the assumption that the loyal officials want to have the investigation covered up, and Communist agents and Communist dupes protected).

Senator Neely took the floor and ended his oration, saying that "If . . . anyone has . . . slandered his country [sic!] he should be scourged from fellowship with decent people, and be branded like Cain." This was good theater and achieved what it was meant to, for it received wide quotation in the press. Wherry closed the debate, again stating the principle that "It is beneath the dignity of the Senate . . . to let an Under Secretary of any department charge either in a letter or an oral statement a Senator with being untruthful." The Administration won because the Republicans reiterated a principle, and the Administration got the headlines.

* * * * *

LOST CAUSE: The legislation for Point Four inspired one of the ablest debates we have ever heard in the Senate. This measure commits us, for 50 years, to government control of foreign investment, trade and philanthropy. The Administration strategy, first tried out in the House, was to attach Point Four to the ECA bill, and pass it as an "emergency". The House Republicans went along, partly no doubt because they knew there had not been enough real debate in the press to alert the section of public opinion that would support them. In the Upper House, a small group of Senators decided to oppose Point Four as a piece of unnecessary spending in view of our present deficit, and also as too amorphous to be passed without further study.

Republicans pointed out that ECA had become something quite different from what the supporters of the Marshall Plan expected. It was providng the money for crimes against the peace of Europe. While we tore down plants needed in Germany, ECA gave the money to rebuild them in France and Luxembourg. While we forbade our traders to sell war material to the U.S.S.R., we gave identical materials to England and France, and the latter sold them to the Soviet Union and its satellites.

Senator Millikin introduced a carefully prepared appeal for a joint study group to make a thorough investigation of the plan for new spending, and report to the next session. It was a straight appeal to reason. Senator Connolly struck a blow for the Administration with a very effective performance. He rose, shook his white curls, looked with mock helplessness through the spectacles at the end of his nose, fluttered his hands feebly, and asked why we needed this "commission of rubbernecks" to study the matter for three or four years. Can't the Senators decide? It was good ham acting.

As the vote was taken on Point Four, one No after another rang out from the Democratic side. The Senate Chamber was hushed as the presiding officer announced the result: Point Four had passed by one vote.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Book Events

Great Mistakes of the War, by Hanson W. Baldwin. New York: Harper and Brothers, $1.50. Reviewed by J. M. Lalley.

Mr. Baldwin's purpose is to show how the peace was lost in the winning of the war. The thesis itself is at this stage of events scarcely susceptible of dispute; for, as Mr. T. S. Eliot has observed, it would require an audacious optimism and a most willful ingenuousness to assert that the expenditure of all the blood, treasure and natural resources has produced a world in any respect better than the world of 1939. One reason for this, Mr. Baldwin tells us, is that the American politicians and generals forgot, or were unable to recognize, that since the war is the continuation of politics, the political consequences are even more important than the military results. In a word, the Americans with their pragmatic genius and metaphysical myopia permitted the end to be obscured by the effort.

Mr. Baldwin undertakes to identify the disastrous political and strategical errors that followed from this subordination of ends to means. The most grevious in its consequences, it appears, was the "unconditional surrender" formula adopted by Messrs. Roosevelt and Churchill at Casablanca, and presently implemented by the saturation bombing of German cities. Even at the beginning of 1943, Mr. Baldwin thinks, it should have been obvious that the only permanent beneficiaries of such a policy would be the Russians, who ironically enough were not a party to the agreement and were careful not to echo the formula in their own propaganda. And while the fatal phrase had perhaps some temporary value in whipping up resolution in the United States, its principal effect was the needless prolongation of the war both in Europe and in the Pacific. It served among other things to dishearten the conspirators of the German underground and to frighten off those officers of the German Army who had been in a mood to join them. The blunder of Casablanca was compounded at Teheran, where Roosevelt and Stalin combined against Churchill to produce the decison that Germany must be attacked frontally by way of the West rather than laterally by way of the Balkans. In this, to be sure, Mr. Roosevelt was indorsing the opinion of his military advisers, and Mr. Baldwin acknowledges that from any strictly military point of view the cross-channel operation was the sounder plan; yet the sequel has shown that it was the means of delivering the East European peoples into Stalin's hands. The fate of Central Europe was sealed by the decision of General Eisenhower, apparently endorsed by President Truman, to halt the eastward advance of the American armies at the line of the Elbe, Mulde and Enns, thereby permitting Berlin, Vienna and Prague to fall to the Red Army.

All these blunders, Mr. Baldwin implies, were committed in a state of political somnambulism governed by three hypnotic suggestions. One was that the collaboration of the Russians in the reconstruction of the world could be purchased by giving them on every possible occasion proof of our implicit trust in their beneficent intentions. Another was the notion that Japan could not be forced to surrender without Russian participation in the Pacific war. The third and perhaps, as Mr. Baldwin seems to suggest, maddest delusion was that momentous political decisions could be safely left to military men, bred in the concept that wars are fought mainly to be won. In the Pacific the results of self-hypnosis by propaganda were not less disastrous than in Europe. There was the stubborn refusal of both statesmen and generals to recognize Chinese Communism for what it was. There was the disposition, persisting until the very eve of victory, to overestimate the Japanese power as grossly as it had been underestimated on the eve of Pearl Harbor. Finally, there was the complete moral surrender to the ideology of the adversary, signified in the needless atomic bombardments of Hiroshima and Nagasaki.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED